

employees' retirement plan. The second thing, a more obvious one. Right now Social Security is taken out of your paycheck. You realize, of course, that by the rules the state also has to kick in a certain amount of Social Security, exactly the same principle as would be embodied in this retirement plan, yet that is already occurring. If that is unconstitutional or if what I am proposing is unconstitutional, then our participation necessarily in the Social Security system would also be. But above and beyond that, as I say, the proposal I am making recites specifically the reasons we are doing it, recites that we are making specific findings with respect to the constitutionality question and the reasons therefore. Will the constitutional test occur? I really doubt it because I doubt anybody believes when they really examine it that it is unconstitutional. Is it an appropriate thing for us to do? Absolutely. What is the cost? About \$88,000 a year, from what I recollect, and I believe they are handing out the information on that. Pat, are they handing out the information on that? Patrick, have they been handing out the material? Okay. So you have the information on the costs. The portion that would have to be picked up because we are implementing something and there are existing legislators already and you have to compensate for that, is another, I don't know, 60 to 70 thousand dollars a year. The point being, for a total cost of somewhere between a 100 and \$150,000, the Legislature is doing something that needs to be done, absolutely needs to be done, and that 42 other states already necessarily do as part of their legislative process. And from the constitutional standpoint, as I say, we think it clear, we think it absolutely clear, those of us supporting this, that when the constitutional language was put in, it contemplated, necessarily contemplated current compensation as opposed to deferred compensation. In fact, in 1932 when the language was put in, it is my recollection from the studies of the subject they didn't even have such things as pension plans, retirement plans, this kind of thing, so only current compensation could have been contemplated and, therefore, the language is clear. We are not afraid of a court test, if one should occur. I think this is the appropriate bill and I would ask the legislators to support putting this proposal in there to get this matter cleared up for now and the future so that future legislators, proposed legislators, candidates, would know what the job entailed when they ran for it and so that the job would entail a reasonable retirement plan as part of it.